

even the revolutions which have taken place
in dress, furniture, repasts, and public amusements. I shall
cheerfully bear the reproach of having descended
below the dignity of history, if I can succeed in placing before
the English of the nineteenth century a true picture of
the life of their ancestors.¹

Nor was Macaulay's example without
effect. A few years after his death, J. R. Green tried to do
for the whole of English history what Macaulay tried to do
for a particular period. 'I have preferred/ wrote Green
in his preface,² 'to pass lightly and briefly over the
details of foreign wars and diplomacies, the personal
adventures of kings and nobles, the pomp of courts, or the
intrigues of favourites, and to dwell at length on the
incidents of that constitutional, intellectual, and social advance
in which we read the history of the nation itself/ The
difference is that Macaulay, while as determined as
Green to write 'the history of the nation itself', was resolved
also to write that of foreign wars and diplomacies, and the
personal adventures which Green preferred to exclude.
For he had none of Green's dislike and disdain for what
is termed 'drum and trumpet history'. On the
contrary, he rejoiced like the war horse in Job, when he
sniffed a battle afar off, a thing very becoming in a former
Secretary at War.

In conclusion, there is one characteristic of

Macauley's
conception of history which must be
pointed out. He
treats history throughout as a part of
literature—' a de-
partment of literature ' is his precise
phrase. In this he
differs from most modern historians. Their
tendency is to
regard history as a branch of science rather
than literature,
and to enlarge upon the difficulty of finding
out the truth,

¹I, 2.

² A Short History of the English People (4 vols. ;
1892).